

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 14, 15 and 25 are amended. Claims 14 – 21 and 25 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

Rejection of claims 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Okada

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Okada et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0055014) (hereinafter, "Okada"). The Examiner alleged that the iridium complex represented by formula K-3 on page 77 of Okada is a complex of the present formula L3M wherein M is Ir and L is represented by Chemical Formula 9 of claim 14. The Examiner further alleged that the complex of formula K-3 is the compound of Chemical Formula 31 of claims 15 and 31. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 is amended to delete the compound of Chemical Formula 9. Further, claims 15 and 25 are amended to delete the complex of Chemical Formula 31. Okada does not teach or suggest a complex of the present formula L3M wherein M is Ir and L is represented by Chemical Formula 4 or Chemical Formula 14 as currently recited in claim 14. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 16 – 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Okada and further in view of Park and Yu

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 16 - 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada and further in view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0042848) and Yu et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0094768). The Examiner acknowledged that Okada does not explicitly disclose a display device having red, green and blue emitting layers. The Examiner alleged that Park and Yu describe full-color devices having red, green and blue emitting layers in which at least one emitter is a phosphorescent emitter and at least one emitter is a fluorescent emitter. The Examiner alleged that it would have been obvious to make a full-color display device using a phosphorescent dopant as allegedly taught by Okada using structural features known in the art of full-color display devices described in Park and Yu. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As described above, Okada does not teach or suggest the particular complexes recited in independent claim 14 wherein L in the formula L3M is represented by the compound of Chemical Formula 4 or the compound of Chemical Formula 14. Park and Yu also do not teach or suggest the specific complexes recited in independent claim 14 and accordingly, do not overcome the deficiencies of Okada. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Igarashi

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 14, 15, 19, 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0019782) (hereinafter, "Igarashi"). The Examiner acknowledged that Igarashi does not explicitly disclose iridium complexes of formula L3M wherein L is represented by Chemical Formulas 4 or 9. The Examiner alleged that the claimed complexes are within the scope of Igarashi's iridium complexes and are similar to specific complexes disclosed. In particular, the Examiner referred to paragraph [0043] of Igarashi as describing that orthometalating ligands of iridium complexes may be aryl group-substituted nitrogen-containing heterocyclic derivatives. The Examiner noted that naphthyl is included in the list of aryl groups and that pyridine is included in a list of nitrogen-containing heterocycles. The Examiner further alleged that it would have been obvious to provide a complex similar to 1-62 of Igarashi but lacking the cyano substituent or a complex similar to 1-60 but having an unsubstituted pyridine ring in place of the isoquinoline ring system. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, claim 14 is amended to delete the compound of Chemical Formula 9, and claims 15 and 25 are amended to delete the complex of Chemical Formula 31. As acknowledged by the Examiner, Igarashi does not disclose the specific iridium complexes of the present claims. In particular, Igarashi does not describe the ligands of Chemical Formulas 4 or 14 of claim 14 or the specific complex of Chemical Formulas 26 of claims 15 and 21. Moreover, Igarashi would not have suggested these particular complexes. In the discussion beginning at page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the complex of formula 26 and the complex of Igarashi's formula 1-62 differ in that the ligands of Igarashi's formula 1-62 have a cyano substituent that is not present in the ligands of the complex of formula 26. Contrary to what is alleged by the Examiner, one would expect the cyano substituent of the ligands of Igarashi's

formula 1-62 to have functional significance, and the disclosure in Igarashi of numerous other types of complexes not having a cyano substituent would actually lead one to believe that there is an unstated reason why the cyano substituent is required in the particular complex of formula 1-62. A person skilled in the art would therefore not expect a compound having the structure of Chemical Formula 4 or the complex of Chemical Formula 26, in which the ligand does not have a cyano group, to have these same properties. Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness over Igarashi. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 16 – 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Igarashi in view of Park and Yu

At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 16-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Igarashi and further in view of Park and Yu. For the following reasons, this rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As described above, Igarashi does not teach or suggest the particular complexes recited in independent claim 14. Park and Yu also do not teach or suggest the specific complexes recited in independent claim 14 and accordingly, do not overcome the deficiencies of Igarashi. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 9/25/08

By:



Michael D. Stein
Registration No. 37,240

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510